

“If no objection or only partial objection is made, the district court judge reviews those unobjected portions for clear error.” *Johnson v. Zema Sys. Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999). As recounted above, the parties have not objected to the recommended disposition of the case. The Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s R&R. The Magistrate Judge engaged in a thorough discussion of the relevant law, and the Court finds that the R&R is not clearly erroneous and is amply supported by the record. Docket entries indicate that the order to show cause and the R&R were returned as undeliverable after being mailed to Martratt. However, as noted by the magistrate judge, “litigants . . . bear the burden of filing notice of a change of address.” R&R at 5 (quoting *Snyder v. Nolen*, 380 F.3d 279, 285 (7th Cir. 2004)).¹ Accordingly, the Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s recommended disposition of the case.

The Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 55) is ADOPTED IN ITS ENTIRETY. Martratt’s claims are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(f)(1) and 41(b) and the Court’s inherent power to manage its own affairs as a result of Martratt’s failure to appear as ordered or to otherwise prosecute his case. The Clerk is directed to enter final judgment against Martratt and in favor of Defendants.

SO ORDERED on October 21, 2025.

s/ Holly A. Brady

 CHIEF JUDGE HOLLY A. BRADY
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

¹ Martratt did file multiple notices of change of address earlier in the case. *See* ECF Nos. 7, 26, 36.